

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on November 3, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claim 26 is amended; as a result, claims 1-31 are now pending in this application.

§101 Rejection of the Claims

Applicants has amended claim 26 accordingly. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 26-28 be withdrawn and such claims be allowed.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Katsavounidis et al describes a system and methods of recovering usable video data from partially corrupted data. Further, inspects corrupted data packets and identify the location or location of an error, whether the corrupted data packet contains data expected to be error-free, and whether the error-free data should be used. Further, in column 8, lines 40-47 Katsavounidis describes the process conceals the error in the missing macroblock by linearly interpolating data from an upper macroblock that is intended to be displayed "above" the missing macroblock that is intended to be displayed "below" the missing macroblock in the image. In contrast, independent claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 24, 29 and amended independent claim 26 recite an error detection and recovery techniques for channel errors, encountered during transmission, found at a decoder end while decoding compressed video signals which is accomplished by analyzing header information in a coded video frame to detect for any channel errors found in the received coded video signal. Further, the coded video frame is corrected for the channel errors by isolating the found channel errors to a few macroblocks in the video frame. Support for this can be found in page 3, lines 9-15 of the specification.

Claims 2-5, 7-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-23, 25, 30-31 and 27-28 are depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 24, 29 and amended independent claim 26 respectively, so they should also be allowable for the reasons presented above.

For the above reasons, claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 24, 29 and amended independent claim 26 should be found allowable over Katsavounidis et al, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-31 as anticipated by Katsavounidis et al should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (603-888-7958) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

ARVIND RAMAN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Global IP Services, PLLC,
198F, 27th Cross, 3rd Block,
Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011

Ph: 603-888-7958

Date: April 12, 2008

By



Prakash Nama

Reg. No. 44,255